

RF:sj 5/23/05 375.1032PAT

PATENT

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the application is respectfully requested. The abstract was objected to. The abstract has now been correct and should be in conformance. Claims 1-11 were objected to due to informalities. The informalities have now been corrected and the claims should be in conformance. Claims 1-5 were rejected under Section 112. The claims have now been amended and should conform to Section 112.

Claims 1, 3, 5, 6, 8-11 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Pfeffer. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

To summarize, the plate of the present invention has a first tongue facing the second tongue so that the foot portion of the first tongue is disposed at one end of the plate and the foot portion of the second tongue is disposed at an opposite end of the plate. The outer free end of the first tongue has a first cavity defined therein and the outer free end of the second tongue has a second cavity defined therein. The outer free end of the second tongue extends into the first cavity and the outer free end of the first tongue extends into the second cavity. The first tongue has first side slits that extend along each side of the first tongue from the foot portion to the outer free end. Similarly, the second tongue has second side slits that extend along each side of the second tongue from the foot portion to the outer free end of the second tongue. The first side slits are parallel to and aligned with the second side slits of the second tongue. None of the cited patents teach or suggest these features.

RF:aj 5/23/05 375.10329AT

PATENT

Pfeffer merely shows a paint brush wiper that has a blade member 24 with L-shaped projecting portions 34, 35 extending inwardly. Pfeffer fails, among other things, to teach or suggest the first projecting portion extending into a cavity of the second projecting portions and the first projecting portion extending into a cavity of the first projecting portion. Also, Pfeffer fails to teach or suggest side slits on each side of the first projecting portion that are parallel to and aligned with slide slits of the second projecting portion and so that the slits extend from the foot portion to the outer free ends of both projecting portions at the slit.

Applicant fails to see why a person of ordinary skill in the art would look to Pfeffer to learn about these features when the features are completely missing from Pfeffer. It is also submitted that Pfeffer does not teach or suggest the required features of the amended claim 1. Pfeffer would require extensive modifications that are not suggested in the cited references.

It is therefore submitted that the amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claim 3 is submitted to be allowable because it depends on the allowable base claim 1.

Claim 5 is submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as those put forth for the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 6, 8-11 are submitted to be allowable because they depend on the allowable base claim 5.

Claims 1-11 were rejected under Section 102 as being anticipated by Painsith. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

RF:ej 5/23/05 375.1032PAT

PATENT

Painsith merely discloses a display frame for photographs. The display has a stand 52 and external legs 54 that are facing one another so that a foot portion of each stand/legs are disposed at opposite side of the display unit. Painsith fails, among other things, to teach or suggest side slits of the stand that are parallel to and aligned with side slits of the legs 54. Also, the stand 52 is remote from the legs 54 so that there is no protruding portion of the stand extending into a cavity of the legs. Even if the legs 54 were adjacent to the stand 52 no protrusion of the stand could extend into a cavity of the legs 54 since the legs are the mirror image of the stand.

Applicant fails to see why a person of ordinary skill in the art would look to Painsith to learn about the features of the amended claim 1 when those features are completely missing from Painsith. Painsith does not suggest those features either. Painsith would require extensive modifications that are not taught or suggested in the cited references.

It is therefore submitted that the amended claim 1 is allowable over the cited references.

Claims 2-4 are submitted to be allowable because they depends on the allowable base claim 1.

Claim 5 is submitted to be allowable for the same reasons as those put forth for the allowability of claim 1.

Claims 6-11 are submitted to be allowable because they depend on the allowable base claim 5.

In view of the above, the application is submitted to be in condition for allowance, and such action is respectfully requested.

RF:bj 5/23/05 375.1032PAT

PATENT

Respectfully submitted,

FASTH LAW OFFICES



Rolf Fasth
Registration No. 36,999

FASTH LAW OFFICES
26 Pinecrest Plaza, Suite 2
Southern Pines, NC 28387-4301

Telephone: (910) 687-0001
Facsimile: (910) 295-2152